



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

C

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/763,246

02/20/2001

Kenping Xie

A34032 PCTUS

5262

52835

7590

11/03/2006

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.

P.O. BOX 2902

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902

EXAMINER

PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/763,246	Applicant(s) XIE ET AL.	
	Examiner Hassan Phillips	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6 and 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed August 15, 2006.

Specification

2. In response to the amendment made to the disclosure to delete paragraph [0015] beginning on page 4, examiner has withdrawn the objections to the disclosure under 35 U.S.C. 132(a).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 15, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues:

- a) Low et al. do not teach or suggest a method of assigning to an online computer a unique FDCA; and,
- b) Low et al. in view of Kelly fail to teach or suggest a FDCA that includes an online number that is specified by the country or area.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions.

4. With regards to a) and b), as expressed by examiner in previous actions, Low teaches a method for assigning to an online computer a unique FDCA, where Low discloses assigning a code to the URI of a server, (col. 11, line 62-col. 12, line 3). In giving the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, examiner has interpreted the FDCA claimed by applicant to be the "code" taught by Low. Applicant has

Art Unit: 2151

acknowledged this in previous remarks. As previously indicated, examiner submits that as claimed, applicants definition of an FDCA is "an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, which number is specified by the country or area; a telephone number, said telephone number comprising the IDDD code of the country where a computer user is located, the area code of the domestic DDD of the user's area, and the telephone number of the user's company or home; and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number specified by the country or area for uniformly demarcating a business category". Since Low teaches the code being an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, (col. 10, lines 28-63, col. 11, line 62 through col. 12, line 3), and a telephone number of the user's company or home, and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 28-63), examiner submits the code taught by Low reads on applicant's claimed invention. Furthermore, as indicated in previous actions, examiner admits Low fails to expressly teach the number being specified by the country or area.

Nevertheless, the teachings of Kelly make up for such teachings not expressly disclosed in Low. More specifically, Kelly teaches a method for translating a domain name into a network protocol address comprising: a telephone number (the domain name) being specified by a country and an area, (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low to show the digital number, the telephone number, and the category number being specified by the country or the area because this would have provided an effective and

Art Unit: 2151

efficient means for assigning addresses to online computers located anywhere in the world, (Kelly, col. 9, lines 12-34).

5. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 6, 8-17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low et al. (hereinafter Low), U.S. Patent 6,243,443, in view of Kelly, U.S. Patent 6,594,254.

8. In considering claim 1, Low teaches a method for assigning a unique full digital code address (FDCA) to an online computer, the method comprising assigning to said computer an FDCA which comprises: an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, (col. 10, lines 28-63, col. 11, line 62 through col. 12, line 3); a telephone number of the user's company or home,

Art Unit: 2151

and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 28-63).

Although the disclosed method of Low shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: a number being specified by the country or area.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Kelly discloses a method for translating a domain name into a network protocol address comprising: a telephone number (the domain name) being specified by a country and an area, (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 31).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low to show the digital number, the telephone number, and the category number being specified by the country or the area. This would have provided an effective and efficient means for assigning addresses to online computers located anywhere in the world, Kelly, col. 9, lines 12-34.

9. In considering claim 6, although the disclosed method of Low shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: assigning dynamic addresses.

Nevertheless, assigning fixed and dynamic addresses was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Kelly discloses: clients having fixed, and dynamic IP addresses, (col. 7, lines 39-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low to assign dynamic addresses to temporary on-line computers. This

would have provided an effective and efficient means assigning addresses to computers when there are more computers than the amount of fixed addresses available.

10. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Low provide a means for accessing an E-mail box by inputting the FDCA into a modem of a computer by dialing a telephone keyboard (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 4), linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

11. In considering claim 9, Low teaches browsing the Internet by inputting the FDCA into a modem of the computer by dialing up a keyboard of a dial-up telephone (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 4), linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

12. In considering claim 10, the teachings of Low provide a means for accessing an E-mail box by inputting the FDCA into a keyboard of the computer, linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

13. In considering claim 11, Low teaches browsing the Internet by inputting the FDCA into a keyboard of the computer, linking to the FDCA, and converting the FDCA using dedicated software, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

14. In considering claim 12 Low teaches converting the FDCA using dedicated interpreting software into an IP address, whereby the FDCA corresponds appropriately to one existing IP address, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

15. In considering claim 13, Low teaches converting the FDCA using dedicated interpreting software into a domain name, whereby the FDCA corresponds appropriately to one existing domain name, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

16. In considering claim 14, the teachings of Low provide a means for converting the FDCA using dedicated interpreting software into a Chinese hierarchy system domain name, whereby the FDCA corresponds appropriately to one existing Chinese hierarchy system domain name, (col. 10, lines 38-50).

17. In considering claim 15, the teachings of Low provide a means for assigning a subcategory number following the category number, (col. 7, lines 42-62, col. 10, lines 38-63).

18. In considering claim 16, although the disclosed method of Low shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: encrypting numbers.

Nevertheless, encrypting numbers was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. Kelly discloses: digital numbers being encrypted depending on the secure nature of a network, (col. 16, lines 20-44).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Low in order to encrypt a digital number following the online number. This would have provided an effective and efficient means for securely validating the online number, (Kelly, col. 16, lines 20-24).

19. In considering claim 17, the teachings of Low provide a means for assigning an address to a mailbox, wherein the mail box address comprises a user name digital number and a domain name of a mail server where the mailbox is located, (col. 10, lines 38-63).

Conclusion

20. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2151


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is 571-272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HP/
10/24/06



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100